

REMARKS

The Office examined claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11 and rejected same. With this paper, claims 1 and 6 are amended, and claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11 remain pending.

Rejection of claims 1 and 6

At section 3 of the Office action, claims 1, 3-6, and 8-11 are rejected under 35 USC §103 as unpatentable over G. Camarillo (RFC 3486 dated February 2003) in view of Bergenlid et al. (US 2003/0156578).

The independent claims are claims 1 and 6.

In rejecting claim 1 (and later also claim 6), the Office asserts at section 4 that Camarillo teaches the invention as in claim 1 except for the request message being a register message and the response message being a 401 (unauthorized) message, and that Bergenlid makes up for such shortcomings, noting the teaching in Bergenlid of the conventional use of a register message and an unauthorized message.

Applicant has argued that the combination made in the Office action fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations recited in claims 1 and 6, because it fails to teach or suggest a UE examining a response to a register message sent to a SIP outbound proxy server in order to determine a compression technique supported by the SIP outbound proxy server. Applicant has argued in particular that although Camarillo's teaches an outbound proxy server providing an alternative SIP URI with a compression parameter "comp=sigcomp" in a Contact header field in a 200 OK response to an OPTIONS request message and the client can use this URI with the compression parameter "comp=sigcomp" for subsequent communications with this outbound proxy server using compression, such teaching is not the invention as claimed, because Camarillo also fails to teach examining a response to a

register message (as opposed to an OPTIONS request message) to determine compression.

Nevertheless, applicant has here amended claims 1 and 6 to recite that it is the payload part of a compressed response message (sent in response to a register message) that is examined according to the invention in order to determine a compression to use (i.e. the compression is determined by e.g. trying different ways of uncompressing the payload, and if one works, the corresponding compression is at least one being used). Support is at page 5, line 31, explaining that it is the payload (not the header) that is compressed, and so it must be that it is the payload part of the message that is examined (recited as "analyzed") to determine whether there is compression and what type of compression is in use. Applicant respectfully points out that the application beginning at page 6, line 19, and continuing to page 8, line 2, discloses an embodiment making use of the compression parameter sigcomp, an embodiment not now claimed. Then at page 8, in the paragraph beginning line 3, the invention is described in terms of "alternative" embodiments encompassed by claims 1 and 6, not "aligned" with Camarillo (RFC 3486), i.e. not making use of the sigcomp parameter (in the header of a message). Thus, in these embodiments something is done other than simply making use of the sigcomp parameter. The application at page 8 explains that "a compressed message" is examined, and applicant submits that one skilled in the art would easily understand that the payload part of a message (as opposed to a header) that is being examined (since it is only the payload part that is compressed), and that the examining consists of guessing a type of compression, trying the corresponding decompression and if it does not work then trying another type of compression.

Since the combination of Camarillo and Bergenlid can at best be said to teach indicating compression using the "comp=sigcomp" parameter in the header of a message (a message which is not,

applicant emphasizes, a response to a register message), applicant respectfully submits that claims 1 and 6 as amended are clearly distinguished from the combined teachings of Camarillo and Bergenlid, and accordingly, applicant respectfully requests that the rejections under 35 USC §103 of claims 1 and 6 be reconsidered and withdrawn, and so also for the other claims, in view of their dependencies.

Conclusion

For all the foregoing reasons it is believed that all of the claims of the application are in condition for allowance and their passage to issue is earnestly solicited. Applicant's attorney urges the Examiner to call to discuss the present response if anything in the present response is unclear or unpersuasive.

November 23, 2005

Date

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468-0224

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Retter

Registration No. 41,266

tel: (203) 261-1234

Cust. No.: 004955